

Quasi parton distributions and the gradient flow

Christopher Monahan*

*New High Energy Theory Center and Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey,
136 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019, USA*

Kostas Orginos

*Physics Department, College of William and Mary,
Williamsburg, Virginia 23187, U.S.A. and
Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, Newport News, Virginia 23606, U.S.A.*

(Dated: December 8, 2016)

We propose a new approach to determining quasi parton distribution functions (PDFs) from lattice quantum chromodynamics. By incorporating the gradient flow, this method guarantees that the lattice quasi PDFs are finite in the continuum limit and evades the thorny, and as yet unresolved, issue of the renormalization of quasi PDFs on the lattice. In the limit that the flow time is much smaller than the length scale set by the nucleon momentum, the moments of the smeared quasi PDF are proportional to those of the light-front PDF. We use this relation to derive evolution equations for the matching kernel that relates the smeared quasi PDF and the light-front PDF. As part of this discussion, we elucidate the relationship between the quasi and light-front PDFs.

* chris.monahan@rutgers.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum chromodynamics (QCD) is the theory of the strong nuclear force that connects hadronic bound states to their partonic constituents, quarks and gluons. Although quarks and gluons cannot be directly accessed in experiments, the connection between hadrons and partons can be characterized through parton distribution functions (PDFs).

PDFs capture aspects of hadron structure associated with the momentum, angular momentum and spin of the constituent quarks and gluons, and play a central role in our understanding of high energy hadronic scattering processes (see, for example, [1–3]). Through factorization, the scattering amplitudes of simple scattering processes, such as deep inelastic scattering and Drell-Yan production, can be expressed as the convolution of perturbative coefficients and PDFs, which encapsulate the nonperturbative dynamics of QCD at hadronic scales.

In principle, the direct calculation of PDFs from QCD will provide new insight into hadronic structure, more stringent tests of QCD, and reduced systematic uncertainties in high energy scattering experiments. At present, however, the only systematic method for *ab initio*, nonperturbative QCD calculations is lattice QCD, in which QCD is formulated on a discrete Euclidean hypercube. PDFs are defined in terms of matrix elements of light-front wave functions and cannot be directly determined from Euclidean lattice QCD. PDFs are currently determined from global analyses of a wide range of scattering data (see, for example, [4–8] for a selection of recent analyses).

Lattice QCD calculations have instead focused on the first few Mellin moments of PDFs, which can be related to matrix elements of local twist-two operators, where twist is the dimension minus the spin of the operator. The lattice regulator breaks rotational symmetry, which induces mixing between lattice operators that would not mix in the continuum. The mixing between twist-two operators of different mass dimension introduces power-divergent mixing on the lattice, preventing the extraction of more than three moments of PDFs [9, 10].

Recently a new approach to determining PDFs on the lattice was proposed, via Euclidean counterparts of PDFs generally referred to as quasi PDFs [11–17]. A similar framework was proposed in [18]. The quasi PDFs are Euclidean matrix elements determined at finite nucleon momentum. At large Euclidean momentum, the quasi PDFs can be related to the true PDFs through an effective theory expansion, the Large Momentum Effective Theory (LaMET).

Preliminary lattice calculations have been encouraging [13, 16], although both calculations have incorporated only a single lattice spacing and a full understanding of systematic uncertainties is far from complete. In particular, there are three challenges for the approach as it stands: the

restriction to low nucleon momentum with the computational resources currently available; a full understanding of the renormalisation of extended Euclidean operators; and the precise relation between light-front PDFs and Euclidean quasi PDFs.

These difficulties can be broadly classified as either chiefly practical, or chiefly theoretical. The first challenge, that associated with the systematic uncertainties corresponding to low values of nucleon momentum on current lattices, is largely a practical issue. Studies in the spectator di-quark model [14] suggest that moderate improvements in computational resources, and new algorithms tailored to nucleons with large momentum [19], will likely solve this difficulty, at least to a precision that can contribute to global analyses of the PDFs in regions of parameter space that are experimentally inaccessible. We will not consider these practical difficulties any further and focus instead on the theoretical aspects of quasi PDFs.

We address the theoretical challenges by proposing a new approach to calculating quasi PDFs on the lattice, in which the lattice degrees of freedom are smeared via the gradient flow [20–22]. Using ringed fermions, which do not require any multiplicative wavefunction renormalization [23, 24], the corresponding lattice matrix elements remain finite in the continuum limit. This approach evades the problem of the power-divergence associated with the Wilson line operator that defines the quasi PDF. The renormalization of quasi PDFs has been viewed through the lens of heavy quark effective theory [15] and, more recently, a counterterm procedure has been proposed to remove this power-divergence [25, 26], but neither approach has been established beyond two loops in perturbation theory.

As part of this work, we also address the third challenge and answer the following question: what is the precise relationship between the light-front and quasi PDFs in the infinite momentum limit? As it stands, the relationship between these distributions has been established as a perturbative matching condition, determined at one loop [27]. LaMET provides the connection between the Euclidean matrix elements determined at finite nucleon momentum in lattice calculations and the quasi PDF in the infinite momentum limit. This object, the quasi PDF in the infinite momentum limit, is necessarily still a Euclidean object. A lingering concern has been that there could be hidden subtleties when Wick rotating from the Euclidean quasi PDF to the light-front PDF.

Here we examine the relation between the Euclidean, smeared quasi PDF and the light-front PDF, and focus on the limit in which the flow time is small compared to the length scale set by the nucleon momentum and that the nucleon momentum is sufficiently large that higher twist effects can be neglected. In this limit, we express the moments of the smeared quasi PDF in terms of moments of the light-front PDF via a small flow-time expansion.

By studying the relation between quasi and light-front PDFs through the lens of Mellin moments, we move beyond a purely perturbative matching condition [27]. In addition to studying the smeared quasi PDF, we consider the bare quasi PDF and demonstrate that the Mellin moments of both bare quasi and light-front PDFs are the same, up to corrections suppressed by powers of the nucleon momentum. From this result it follows that there is a simple relation between quasi PDFs in the infinite momentum limit and light-front PDFs. In general, the reconstruction of light-front PDFs from Mellin moments is a nontrivial procedure [28, 29], but here we only require some general properties of the Mellin transforms, based on some mild assumptions about the distributions in Mellin space. Although this result is anticipated, both from expectations based on the calculation at one loop in perturbation theory in [27] and on results in the spectator di-quark approximation [14], our analysis solidifies the theoretical foundation on which the quasi PDF rests

We start by revisiting the definitions of the light-front and quasi PDFs in Section II. We then analyze the relation between the light-front and quasi PDFs in Section III and derive an evolution equation for the matching kernel in Section IV. We present our summary and conclusions in Section V. In the appendices, we state and prove two properties of the bare quasi PDFs that, to our knowledge, have not been explicitly discussed or demonstrated in the literature.

II. DISTRIBUTION FUNCTIONS

Throughout this work we focus on flavor non-singlet unpolarized quasi and light-front PDFs. The extension to polarized quasi PDFs is straightforward. The flavor singlet case introduces additional mixing with the gluon distribution, but the principles are similar. We also assume that the quarks are massless and ignore complications arising from the correct treatment of heavy flavors, a subject of continued study for light-front PDFs (for reviews, see, for example, [30–32]).

A. Bare PDFs

In the following section, when we use the term “bare” we mean finite matrix elements determined with some regulator at finite cutoff. We leave the regulator implicit in this discussion, although one can have in mind dimensional regularization if desired. These bare matrix elements require renormalization in some scheme before one can remove the regulator (or, on the lattice, take the continuum limit). This usage follows that of the extensive discussions of light-front PDFs in, for example, [3, 33].

We denote bare light-front PDFs by $f^{(0)}(\xi)$. Light-front PDFs are frequently represented by $f_{j/N}^{(0)}(\xi)$, where j denotes the quark flavor and N the nucleon species, but here we will be considering only non-singlet distributions, for which we can neglect mixing between parton species, and work with sufficient generality that the nucleon species is not relevant to our discussion. We use light-front coordinates, (x^+, x^-, \mathbf{x}_T) such that $x^\pm = (t \pm z)/\sqrt{2}$, and define $\xi = k^+/P^+$. We use ξ to distinguish this variable from the Bjorken- x parameter that characterizes the kinematics of scattering experiments and is given in terms of the experimental momentum transfer $Q^2 = -q^2$ and hadron momentum P by $x = Q^2/(2P \cdot q)$. The bare PDF is defined as [3]

$$f^{(0)}(\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega^-}{4\pi} e^{-i\xi P^+ \omega^-} \left\langle P \left| T \bar{\psi}(0, \omega^-, \mathbf{0}_T) W(\omega^-, 0) \gamma^+ \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \psi(0) \right| P \right\rangle_C. \quad (1)$$

Here T is the time-ordering operator, ψ is a quark field, and the subscript C indicates that the vacuum expectation value has been subtracted (in other words, only connected contributions are included). The operator $W(\omega^-, 0)$ is the Wilson line,

$$W(\omega^-, 0) = \mathcal{P} \exp \left[-ig_0 \int_0^{\omega^-} dy^- A_\alpha^+(0, y^-, \mathbf{0}_T) T_\alpha \right], \quad (2)$$

with \mathcal{P} the path-ordering operator, g_0 the QCD bare coupling, and $A^\mu = A_\alpha^\mu T_\alpha$ the $SU(3)$ gauge potential with generator T_α (summation over color index α is implicit). The target state, $|P\rangle$, is a spin-averaged, exact momentum eigenstate with relativistic normalization

$$\langle P' | P \rangle = (2\pi)^3 2P^+ \delta(P^+ - P'^+) \delta^{(2)}(\mathbf{P}_T - \mathbf{P}'_T). \quad (3)$$

We define the moments of bare PDFs as

$$a_0^{(n)} = \int_0^1 d\xi \xi^{n-1} \left[f^{(0)}(\xi) + (-1)^n \bar{f}^{(0)}(\xi) \right] = \int_{-1}^1 d\xi \xi^{n-1} f(\xi), \quad (4)$$

where $\bar{f}^{(0)}(\xi)$ is the anti-quark PDF and the second equality follows from the relation of the quark to anti-quark PDFs

$$f^{(0)}(-\xi) = -\bar{f}^{(0)}(\xi), \quad (5)$$

which holds for the bare distributions if the quark and anti-quarks fields are classical, or quantized using light-front quantization [33].

We can relate these bare moments, $a_0^{(n)}$, to matrix elements of twist-two operators via

$$\left\langle P | \mathcal{O}_0^{\{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n\}} | P \right\rangle = 2a_0^{(n)} (P^{\mu_1} \dots P^{\mu_n} - \text{traces}). \quad (6)$$

Here the bare twist-two operators are

$$\mathcal{O}_0^{\{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n\}} = i^{n-1} \bar{\psi}(0) \gamma^{\{\mu_1} D^{\mu_2} \dots D^{\mu_n\}} \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \psi(0) - \text{traces}. \quad (7)$$

In these expressions the braces denote symmetrization, D^μ is the symmetric covariant derivative, λ^a are $SU(2)$ flavor matrices, and the subtraction of the trace terms ensures that the operator transforms irreducibly under $SU(2)_L \otimes SU(2)_R$.

B. Renormalized PDFs

To this point we have considered the bare light-front PDFs, with the understanding that such objects are evaluated with some regulator that renders the bare distributions finite. We now introduce renormalized light-front PDFs. We stress that in this section we consider a renormalization scheme that respects rotational symmetry and, for definiteness, one can have in mind the \overline{MS} scheme. Complications will arise if a regulator that breaks rotational invariance, such as the lattice regulator, is used. We do not discuss such complications here, because we will avoid explicit computations of moments at finite lattice spacing. All correlation functions computed on the lattice can be renormalized and extrapolated to the continuum limit, provided that no power divergent mixing exists. In the next section, we propose a smeared correlation function that does not have power-divergent mixing.

In general, renormalized light-front PDFs are written in terms of a kernel, $\mathcal{Z}(\zeta/\xi, \mu)$, as

$$f(\xi, \mu) = \int_x^1 \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta} \mathcal{Z}\left(\frac{\zeta}{\xi}, \mu\right) f^{(0)}(\zeta), \quad (8)$$

where μ is some renormalization scale. We do not need to consider mixing between parton species for non-singlet distributions. In terms of the renormalized light-front PDF, the renormalized Mellin moments are

$$a^{(n)}(\mu) = \int_0^1 d\xi \xi^{n-1} [f(\xi, \mu) + (-1)^n \bar{f}(\xi, \mu)] = \int_{-1}^1 d\xi \xi^{n-1} f(\xi, \mu), \quad (9)$$

which can be related to matrix elements of renormalized twist-two operators, $\mathcal{O}^{\{\nu_1 \dots \nu_n\}}(\mu) = Z_{\mathcal{O}}(\mu) \mathcal{O}_0^{\{\nu_1 \dots \nu_n\}}$, via

$$\langle P | \mathcal{O}^{\{\nu_1 \dots \nu_n\}}(\mu) | P \rangle = 2a^{(n)}(\mu) (P^{\nu_1} \dots P^{\nu_n} - \text{traces}). \quad (10)$$

This relation holds provided the light-front PDFs and twist-two operators are renormalized in the same scheme [33].

C. Smeared quasi PDFs

We construct a finite quasi PDF matrix element by smearing both the fermion and gauge fields via the gradient flow [20–22]. The gradient flow is a deterministic evolution of the original quark and gluon fields in a new dimension, generally referred to as the “flow time”, towards a classical minimum of the QCD action [21, 22]. The flow-time evolution is chosen to remove ultraviolet fluctuations, which corresponds to smearing out the quark and gluon fields in real space, with a smearing scale that is proportional to the square-root of the flow time. Here we will not describe in detail the gradient flow, but refer the reader to the recent reviews [34, 35] for more details and applications.

For our purposes, it is sufficient that the gradient flow has the following properties. First, the gradient flow serves as a gauge-invariant ultraviolet regulator. Second, given a renormalized theory at zero flow time, the matrix elements of smeared fields are automatically finite, up to a multiplicative wave-function renormalization for the fermion fields [22], which can be removed by introducing ringed fermion fields [23, 24]. Third, the lattice matrix elements of smeared fields remain finite in the continuum limit, provided the flow time is fixed in physical units [22, 36]. In essence, the gradient flow allows one to replace the lattice regulator with a new smearing-scale regulator. This last fact allows one to determine the continuum limit of lattice matrix elements of, for example, twist-two operators, without power-divergent mixing. In the continuum, because the gradient flow respects rotational symmetry, the mixing between twist-two operators is then reduced to ordinary mixing with coefficients that depend on the smearing scale and not powers of the inverse lattice spacing [36].

We denote the ringed fermion fields at flow time τ by $\overline{\chi}(x; \tau)$ and $\chi(x; \tau)$, and the corresponding Wilson line at the same flow time, constructed from the smeared gauge fields $B_\mu(x; \tau)$, by $\mathcal{W}(0, z; \tau)$. We start with the matrix element

$$h^{(s)} \left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{\tau}}, \sqrt{\tau} P_z, \tau \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau} M_N \right) = \frac{1}{2P_z} \left\langle P_z \left| \overline{\chi}(z; \tau) \mathcal{W}(0, z; \tau) \gamma_z \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \chi(0; \tau) \right| P_z \right\rangle_C, \quad (11)$$

which, being dimensionless, depends only on dimensionless combinations of scales. We note that the flow time has units of length-squared. The subscript C indicates that disconnected contributions to this matrix element have been removed. The ringed fermion fields require no wave function renormalization and this smeared matrix element is finite provided the flow time, τ , is non-zero and fixed in physical units, because correlation functions constructed from smeared fields are finite [21, 22]. Note that divergences will appear in the limit of vanishing flow time and the matrix

element will then require renormalization.

We then define the quasi PDF [11, 12] as

$$q^{(s)}(\xi, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi} e^{i\xi z P_z} P_z h^{(s)}(\sqrt{\tau}z, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N), \quad (12)$$

where ξ is a dimensionless parameter that can be naively interpreted as the longitudinal momentum fraction of the parton in the nucleon N . This interpretation is not correct in Euclidean space, however, and instead ξ should be viewed as a dimensionless momentum variable in a Fourier transformation.

In practice, the smeared matrix element h is determined from lattice computations at finite lattice spacing, a , as

$$h^{(s)}\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{\tau}}, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N\right) = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} h\left(\frac{z}{a}, \frac{\tau}{a^2}, aP_z, a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}, aM_N\right), \quad (13)$$

where τ/a^2 is held fixed and

$$h\left(\frac{z}{a}, \frac{\tau}{a^2}, aP_z, a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}, aM_N\right) = \frac{1}{2aP_z} \left\langle aP_z \left| \bar{\chi}\left(\frac{z}{a}; \frac{\tau}{a^2}\right) W\left(0, \frac{z}{a}; \frac{\tau}{a^2}\right) \gamma_z \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \chi\left(0; \frac{\tau}{a^2}\right) \right| aP_z \right\rangle_C. \quad (14)$$

III. RELATION TO LIGHT-FRONT DISTRIBUTIONS

We discuss the relation between quasi and light-front PDFs by examining the Mellin moments of these distribution, and using the connection between Mellin moments and matrix elements of local operators, which are twist-two in the case of light-front PDFs [37]. For the quasi PDFs, the local operators corresponding to the Mellin moments do not have a well-defined twist, but can be related to twist-two operators after subtracting higher twist effects and applying target-mass corrections [13, 16]. Although we are now considering smeared matrix elements, the arguments regarding higher twist and target mass effects in [13, 16] still apply, because the flow time serves as an alternative gauge-invariant regulator to the lattice spacing.

We connect the Mellin moments of the quasi PDF to matrix elements of local operators in the following way. Working in axial gauge, $B_z(x; \tau) = 0$, the matrix element $h^{(s)}$ is

$$h^{(s)}\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{\tau}}, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N\right) \Big|_{B_z=0} = \frac{1}{2P_z} \left\langle P_z \left| \bar{\chi}(z; \tau) \gamma_z \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \chi(0; \tau) \right| P_z \right\rangle_C. \quad (15)$$

We now substitute this expression into the definition of the quasi PDF, Equation (12), and integrate the resulting expression over the full range of ξ . In contrast to the light-front PDF, this range

extends from negative to positive infinity, giving

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi q^{(s)}(\xi, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N) \Big|_{B_z=0} = h^{(s)}(0, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N) \Big|_{B_z=0}. \quad (16)$$

Here we have used the relation $\delta(zP_z) = \delta(z)/P_z$, for $P_z > 0$. We see that the first Mellin moment of the quasi PDF can be expressed in terms of the Euclidean matrix element of a local (smeared) operator.

We extend this argument to arbitrary moments of quasi PDFs by considering derivatives of the quasi distribution with respect to the spatial separation z [3]. Inverting the Fourier transform in Equation (12), we have

$$h^{(s)}\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{\tau}}, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi e^{-i\xi z P_z} q^{(s)}(\xi, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N). \quad (17)$$

Applying derivatives with respect to the displacement z , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{i}{P_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right)^{n-1} h^{(s)}\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{\tau}}, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N\right) = \\ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \xi^{n-1} e^{-i\xi z P_z} q^{(s)}(\xi, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Evaluating these derivatives at $z = 0$ leads to

$$\left(\frac{i}{P_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right)^{n-1} h^{(s)}\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{\tau}}, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N\right) \Big|_{z=0} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \xi^{n-1} q^{(s)}(\xi, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N). \quad (19)$$

Defining the moments of the smeared quasi PDF, $b_n^{(s)}$, as

$$b_n^{(s)}\left(\sqrt{\tau}P_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \xi^{n-1} q^{(s)}(\xi, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N), \quad (20)$$

and substituting the definition of the matrix element $h^{(s)}$, given in Equation (11), into Equation (19), we obtain

$$b_n^{(s)}\left(\sqrt{\tau}P_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right)_{B_z=0} = \frac{1}{2P_z^n} \left\langle P_z \left| \left[\bar{\chi}(z; \tau) \gamma_z \left(i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_z^{n-1} \right) \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \chi(0; \tau) \right]_{z=0} \right| P_z \right\rangle_C. \quad (21)$$

We restore gauge invariance to obtain our final expression for the moments of quasi PDFs in terms of Euclidean matrix elements of local operators:

$$b_n^{(s)}\left(\sqrt{\tau}P_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) = \frac{1}{2P_z^n} \left\langle P_z \left| \left[\bar{\chi}(z; \tau) \gamma_z (i \overleftrightarrow{D}_z)^{(n-1)} \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \chi(0; \tau) \right]_{z=0} \right| P_z \right\rangle_C. \quad (22)$$

The local operators that appear in the matrix element on the right hand side of this expression are not twist-two operators: they are not symmetric and traceless. The discrepancy between these matrix elements and matrix elements of twist-two operators are given by corrections that appear at

$\mathcal{O}(M_N^2/P_z^2)$ [13, 16] and correspond to target mass corrections [38, 39]. Although the appropriate interpretation of PDFs in the presence of these target mass corrections is subtle [40], for our purposes it is sufficient that these non-leading corrections can be absorbed by writing [13, 16]

$$b_n^{(s)}\left(\sqrt{\tau}P_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}\right) = \frac{1}{2P_z^n} \left\langle P_z \left| \left[\bar{\chi}(z; \tau) \gamma_z (i\overleftarrow{D}_z)^{(n-1)} \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \chi(0; \tau) \right]_{z=0} \right| P_z \right\rangle_C K_n^{-1} \left(\frac{M_N^2}{4P_z^2} \right), \quad (23)$$

where

$$K_n \left(\frac{M_N^2}{4P_z^2} \right) = \sum_{j=0}^{n/2} \binom{n-j}{j} \left(\frac{M_N^2}{4P_z^2} \right)^j. \quad (24)$$

The corrected matrix elements on the right hand side of this equation can now be expanded in a Taylor series with respect to $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2/P_z^2$. The coefficients in this expansion represent higher twist effects that arise because the original matrix element is not a matrix element of a twist-two operator. Furthermore, if we assume the flow time τ is small compared to the length scale defined by the momentum P_z , we can expand the moments of the smeared operator in powers of τP_z^2 . The leading coefficient in this double expansion is a twist-two contribution that can depend only on the nucleon structure and the flow time. One can think of obtaining this leading term from a twist-two matrix element between nucleon states of a given momentum P_z , divided by an appropriate power of the momentum, which is dictated by the transformation properties of the matrix element under rotations. Therefore, applying this double expansion, we write the moments as

$$b_n^{(s)}(\sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2) = b_n^{(s, \text{twist}-2)}(\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2}{P_z^2}, \tau P_z^2\right), \quad (25)$$

where, for $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2/P_z^2 \ll 1$, the higher twist corrections can be ignored and for small flow time, $\tau P_z^2 \ll 1$, effects proportional to τP_z^2 can be neglected.

In summary, we assume that: first, we can correct exactly for target mass corrections; second, we can take the momentum P_z sufficiently large that higher twist effects are negligible; and third, the flow time is sufficiently small that τP_z^2 can be neglected. Then, under these assumptions, the moments of the smeared quasi PDFs are only functions of the dimensionless quantity $\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$ and are pure twist-two matrix elements containing information about the structure of the hadron.

Putting this all together, and using the fact that the $b_n^{(s)}$ are the moments of the quasi PDF, Equation (20), we conclude that if

$$\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}, M_N \ll P_z \ll \tau^{-1/2}, \quad (26)$$

then the smeared quasi PDF obeys

$$q^{(s)}(\xi, \sqrt{\tau}P_z, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2, \sqrt{\tau}M_N) = q^{(s)}(\xi, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2}{P_z^2}, \frac{M_N^2}{P_z^2}, \tau P_z^2\right). \quad (27)$$

The leading term is a smeared quasi PDF whose moments are related to smeared twist-two matrix elements. If target mass corrections have not been exactly removed, then there are no $\mathcal{O}(M_n^2/P_z^2)$ corrections. Here we leave the expression in complete generality, because, looking toward future work, it is not clear whether target mass corrections can be applied exactly to, for example, polarized PDFs.

In the remaining discussion, we will assume that the conditions of Equation (26) apply and ignore higher order corrections. In this regime the smeared quasi PDFs are only functions of ξ and $\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$.

A. Short distance expansion

We can now relate the moments of the smeared quasi PDF $b_n^{(s,\text{twist}-2)}(\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2)$, which are local matrix elements of smeared fields, to the renormalized moments of the light-front PDFs, by using the properties of the gradient flow that arise from a short distance expansion [21, 23, 24, 41, 42]. In the following, we omit the superscript “twist-two” as we will consider the leading moments that are obtained in the limit that satisfies Equation (26). The exponentially local nature of the smearing procedure allows for a short distance expansion of the smeared local operators in terms of renormalized operators in some renormalization scheme, such as the \overline{MS} scheme. It is straightforward to show that this short distance expansion leads to

$$b_n^{(s)}(\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2) = C_n^{(0)}(\mu^2\tau)a^{(n)}(\mu) + \mathcal{O}(\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2), \quad (28)$$

where μ is a renormalization scale. The leading order term in this expansion, $a^{(n)}(\mu)$, is the matrix element of a renormalized twist-two operator with the same gamma matrix and derivative structure as the smeared operator that appears in the matrix element on the left hand side. The higher order terms arise from higher dimension operators that enter the short distance expansion of the smeared matrix element. Both the leading short distance coefficient function, $C_n^{(0)}(\mu^2\tau)$, and the higher order corrections can be computed in perturbation theory, so that this approximation can be systematically improved. For the rest of this discussion, we will assume that $\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2 \ll 1$, so that power corrections can be ignored.

To relate the smeared quasi PDF with the light-front PDF, we introduce a kernel function, $Z(x, \tau\mu^2)$, whose Mellin moments are given by

$$\left[C_n^{(0)}(\mu^2\tau) \right]^{-1} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx x^{n-1} Z(x, \tau\mu^2). \quad (29)$$

With this definition, and using the properties of multiplicative convolution, we find

$$f(x, \mu) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} Z\left(\frac{x}{\xi}, \tau\mu^2\right) q^{(s)}(\xi, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2) + \mathcal{O}(\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2). \quad (30)$$

We introduce the inverse kernel through

$$C_n^{(0)}(\mu^2\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx x^{n-1} \tilde{Z}(x, \tau\mu^2), \quad (31)$$

which leads to

$$q^{(s)}(x, \tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2) = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \tilde{Z}(x/\xi, \tau\mu^2) f(\xi, \mu) + \mathcal{O}(\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2) \quad (32)$$

Note that all of these relations are only valid if

$$\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}, M_N \ll P_z \ll \tau^{-1/2}. \quad (33)$$

Furthermore, the kernel functions can be computed in continuum perturbation theory, following the methods introduced in [21] and the examples in [15, 18, 25, 26].

We stress that, in contrast to the original work by Ji, in which factorization occurs in the limit of large nucleon momentum, P_z , here we only require the momentum to be much larger than the hadronic scales involved. In Ji's approach, in the limit of infinitely large nucleon momentum, the relation between the bare quasi PDFs and the light-front PDFs is simple, as we demonstrate in Appendix A. Here the large nucleon momentum serves only to suppress higher twist contributions. In addition, we have introduced a new scale, the (inverse) flow time, τ^{-1} , that needs to be large but finite. These requirements on the hierarchy of scales, expressed in Equation (33), are no different in nature than the requirements used to factor physical cross-sections into PDFs and Wilson coefficients and are similar in spirit to the factorization approach proposed in [18, 26]. In this approach, the renormalization scale and the factorization scale are distinct and separate from the large momentum, which suppresses higher twist effects.

IV. DGLAP-LIKE EQUATION FOR THE MATCHING KERNEL

Ignoring mixing between quark flavors and gluons (i.e. looking at the non-singlet distributions) the renormalized PDFs satisfy a DGLAP equation [43–45] that describes their scale dependence

$$\mu \frac{d f(x, \mu)}{d\mu} = \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} \int_x^1 \frac{dy}{y} f(y, \mu) P\left(\frac{x}{y}\right). \quad (34)$$

Here $P(z)$ is a function whose moments are the anomalous dimensions $\gamma^{(n)}$ of the moments of the PDFs,

$$\int_0^1 dx x^{n-1} P(x) = \gamma^{(n)}, \quad (35)$$

where

$$\left[\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} - \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} \gamma^{(n)} \right] a^{(n)}(\mu) = 0, \quad (36)$$

and $\alpha_s(\mu)$ is the (renormalized) strong coupling constant.

Similarly, we can derive a DGLAP-like equation for the matching kernel that relates smeared quasi PDFs and light-front PDFs. We start from the small distance expansion in Equation (28), apply the renormalization group operator $\mu d/(d\mu)$, and use Equation (36) to derive a renormalization group equation for the short distance coefficient

$$\left[\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} + \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} \gamma^{(n)} \right] C_n^{(0)}(\mu^2 \tau) = 0 + \mathcal{O}(\tau \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2), \quad (37)$$

and its inverse

$$\left[\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} - \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} \gamma^{(n)} \right] \left[C_n^{(0)}(\mu^2 \tau) \right]^{-1} = 0 + \mathcal{O}(\tau \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2). \quad (38)$$

We can obtain a DGLAP-like equation for the matching kernel by substituting Equations (29) and (35) into this renormalization group equation, to give

$$\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} Z(x, \tau \mu^2) = \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} \int_x^\infty \frac{dy}{y} Z(y, \tau \mu^2) P\left(\frac{x}{y}\right). \quad (39)$$

V. CONCLUSION

Parton distribution functions (PDFs) characterize nucleon structure in terms of the nucleon's constituent quarks and gluons. These PDFs are defined as matrix elements of light-front wave functions and cannot be directly calculated in Euclidean lattice QCD. In principle, however, the Mellin moments of PDFs can be calculated in lattice QCD, through matrix elements of twist-two operators. Unfortunately, these calculations are limited to the first few moments, because the hypercubic symmetry of the lattice regulator induces power-divergent mixing between twist-two operators of different mass dimension, obscuring the continuum limit of matrix elements determined on the lattice. Current determinations of PDFs rely on global analyses of data in a wide range of experimental channels and a determination of PDFs from first principles is lacking.

A new approach to determining PDFs in lattice QCD was recently proposed by Ji and subsequently, through a related framework, by Qiu and Ma. In this approach, one calculates Euclidean quasi PDFs at large nucleon momentum. Two recent lattice calculations provided promising results, but several aspects of the approach are yet to be fully understood. First, there is the practical issue of the systematic uncertainties associated with finite nucleon momenta in lattice calculations. This issue is likely to be resolved, to the extent that lattice calculations will have sufficient precision that results will provide useful input into global analyses where experimental data are inadequate, with improvements in computational resources and the algorithmic advances already underway. Second, there are theoretical issues to be clarified: the renormalization of the extended operator that defines the quasi PDFs; and the relation between the Euclidean quasi PDF and the light-front PDF, which to date had been analyzed through a factorization formula at one loop in perturbation theory.

We have addressed these theoretical considerations by introducing a quasi PDF constructed from fields smeared via the gradient flow. We explicitly demonstrated that there is a simple relation between the Mellin moments of the smeared Euclidean quasi PDF and the renormalized Mellin moments of the light-front PDF, once nucleon mass corrections are incorporated and provided the flow time is small relative to the inverse nucleon momentum. Corrections to this relation appear at $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2/P_z^2)$, where P_z is the Euclidean momentum of the nucleon, and $\mathcal{O}(\tau\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2)$, where τ is the flow time. From this correspondence it follows that, provided $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}, M_N \ll P_z \ll \tau^{-1/2}$, the quasi PDF and light-front PDF can be matched through a convolution relation.

The gradient flow renders the quasi PDF finite in the continuum limit and evades the issues of the renormalization of the non-local operator that defines the quasi PDF on the lattice. The resulting continuum matrix elements can be matched directly to the corresponding light-front PDFs in the \overline{MS} scheme in continuum perturbation theory. Combined with a nonperturbative step-scaling procedure, this matching can be carried out at an energy sufficiently high that perturbative truncation errors are no longer uncontrolled. The nonperturbative implementation of our proposal is work in progress.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Xiangdong Ji, Herbert Neuberger, Jianwei Qiu, and Christian Weisz for enlightening discussions during the course of this work. We are particularly grateful to Carl Carlson for reading an early draft of this manuscript. K.O. has been supported by the U.S. Department of

Energy through Grant Number DE- FG02-04ER41302, and through contract Number DE-AC05-06OR23177, under which JSA operates the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility.

Appendix A: The equivalence of Mellin moments

In this appendix we connect the Mellin moments of the bare PDF and bare, unsmeared quasi PDF. From that connection it follows that the Wick rotation from the bare Euclidean quasi PDF to the light-front PDF is simple.

The bare, unsmeared quasi PDF is

$$q^{(0)}\left(\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi} e^{-i\xi z P_z} h^{(0)}\left(zP_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where, in axial gauge, $A_z = 0$, the matrix element $h^{(0)}$ is

$$h^{(0)}\left(zP_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) = \frac{1}{2P_z} \left\langle P_z \left| \bar{\psi}(z) \mathcal{W}(0, z) \gamma_z \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \psi(0) \right| P_z \right\rangle_C. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Here $\mathcal{W}(0, z)$ is the Wilson line operator and all fields that appear in this matrix element are bare, unsmeared fields.

Inverting the Fourier transform in Equation (A1), we have

$$h^{(0)}\left(zP_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi e^{i\xi z P_z} q^{(0)}\left(\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right). \quad (\text{A3})$$

Applying derivatives with respect to the displacement z , we obtain

$$\left(\frac{-i}{P_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right)^{n-1} h^{(0)}\left(zP_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \xi^{n-1} e^{i\xi z P_z} q^{(0)}\left(\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right). \quad (\text{A4})$$

Evaluating these derivatives at $z = 0$ leads to

$$\left(\frac{-i}{P_z} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right)^{n-1} h^{(0)}\left(zP_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) \Big|_{z=0} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \xi^{n-1} q^{(0)}\left(\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right). \quad (\text{A5})$$

Defining the bare moments of the quasi PDF, $b_n^{(0)}$, as

$$b_n^{(0)}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \xi^{n-1} q^{(0)}\left(\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right), \quad (\text{A6})$$

and substituting the definition of the matrix element $h^{(0)}$, given in Equation (A2), into Equation (A5), we obtain

$$b_n^{(0)}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) \Big|_{A_z=0} = \frac{1}{2P_z^n} \left\langle P_z \left| \left[\bar{\psi}(z) \gamma_z \left(-i \overleftarrow{\partial}_z^{n-1}\right) \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \psi(0) \right] \right| P_z \right\rangle_C, \quad (\text{A7})$$

We restore gauge invariance by invoking the principle of minimal coupling to obtain our final expression for the moments of quasi PDFs in terms of Euclidean matrix elements of local operators:

$$b_n^{(0)} \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z} \right) = \frac{1}{2P_z^n} \left\langle P_z \left| \bar{\psi} \gamma_z (-i \overleftrightarrow{D}_z)^{(n-1)} \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \psi(0) \right| P_z \right\rangle_C. \quad (\text{A8})$$

As in Section III, the local operators that appear in the matrix element on the right hand side of this expression are not symmetric and traceless. Accounting for target-mass corrections [13, 16], we have

$$b_n^{(0)} \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z} \right) = \frac{1}{2P_z^n} \left\langle P_z \left| \bar{\psi} \gamma_z (-i \overleftrightarrow{D}_z)^{(n-1)} \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \psi(0) \right| P_z \right\rangle_C K_n^{-1} \left(\frac{M_N^2}{4P_z^2} \right), \quad (\text{A9})$$

where

$$K_n \left(\frac{M_N^2}{4P_z^2} \right) = \sum_{j=0}^{n/2} \binom{n-j}{j} \left(\frac{M_N^2}{4P_z^2} \right)^j, \quad (\text{A10})$$

so we can write

$$b_n^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2P_z^n} \langle P | \mathcal{O}_0^{z \dots z} | P \rangle + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2}{P_z^2} \right), \quad (\text{A11})$$

for $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2/P_z^2 \ll 1$. Then, comparing Equation (A11) and the expression for the moments of the light-front PDFs, $a_n^{(0)}$, in Equation (6), we deduce that

$$b_n^{(0)} = a_n^{(0)}. \quad (\text{A12})$$

Thus, the moments of bare quasi PDFs are exactly those of the bare light-front PDF.

To see that from this equality, it follows that the relation of the bare quasi PDF to the bare light-front PDF is simple, we consider the difference of the two moments,

$$c_n^{(0)} = b_n^{(0)} - a_n^{(0)}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

This difference is exactly zero for all non-negative integer n . We now define the analytic continuation of $c_n^{(0)}$ to the complex- n plane for $\text{Re}(n) > -1$ such that

$$c^{(0)}(n) = c_n^{(0)} \quad (\text{A14})$$

for n a non-negative integer. Under the mild assumptions that this function $c^{(0)}(n)$ is analytic and continuous for $\text{Re}(n) \geq 0$ and that it is of exponential type [46], Carlson's theorem guarantees that $c^{(0)}(n)$ is identically zero. Defining the corresponding analytic continuations $a^{(0)}(n)$ and $b^{(0)}(n)$, we deduce that

$$a^{(0)}(n) = b^{(0)}(n), \quad (\text{A15})$$

again for $\text{Re}(n) > -1$.

Formally, we obtain the PDF and quasi PDF by inverting the Mellin transform:

$$f^{(0)}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C}} dn \xi^{-n} a^{(0)}(n), \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$q^{(0)}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C}} dn \xi^{-n} a^{(0)}(n), \quad (\text{A17})$$

where we have used Equation (A15) and the contour is chosen to lie in a region of the complex- n plane in which the Mellin transform $a^{(0)}(n)$ is holomorphic. In this case, the Mellin inversion is unique. For a discussion of the conditions under which Mellin inversion is unique, including counter examples, see, for example, [47]. Therefore, the relation of the bare quasi PDF, defined in Euclidean spacetime, to the bare light-front PDF, defined in Minkowski spacetime, is simple.

Appendix B: The antiquark quasi PDF

In this appendix we relate the quasi PDF at negative ξ to the quasi PDF for the anti-quark at positive ξ . We achieve this by anti-commuting the fermion fields in the matrix element of Equation (15) [3]. On the one hand, the anti-quark quasi distribution is defined through the matrix element

$$\bar{h}^{(0)}\left(zP_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) = \frac{1}{2P_z} \left\langle P_z \left| \bar{\chi}(0) \mathcal{W}(0, z) \gamma_z \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \chi(0) \right| P_z \right\rangle_{\text{C}} \quad (\text{B1})$$

to be

$$\bar{q}^{(0)}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi} e^{-i\xi z P_z} \bar{h}^{(0)}\left(zP_z, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right). \quad (\text{B2})$$

On the other, the quasi PDF in axial gauge for negative ξ is

$$q^{(0)}\left(-\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right)_{A_z=0} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{i\xi z P_z} \langle P_z | \bar{\psi}(z) \gamma_z \psi(0) | P_z \rangle_{\text{C}}, \quad (\text{B3})$$

which we can write as

$$q^{(0)}\left(-\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right)_{A_z=0} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{i\xi z P_z} \text{Tr} \gamma_z \langle P_z | \psi(0) \bar{\psi}(z) | P_z \rangle_{\text{C}}, \quad (\text{B4})$$

since for any two spinors ψ and ϕ and Γ a combination of gamma matrices, we have the relation $\psi^\dagger \Gamma \phi = \text{Tr} \Gamma \phi \psi^\dagger$.

Anti-commuting the quark and anti-quark fields gives

$$q^{(0)}\left(-\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z}\right)_{A_z=0} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{i\xi z P_z} \text{Tr} \gamma_z \langle P_z | \{ \psi(0), \bar{\psi}(z) \} - \bar{\psi}(z) \psi(0) | P_z \rangle_{\text{C}}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Here the commutator is an equal-time commutator of two fermionic fields, which is proportional to the unit operator. This is a disconnected contribution, which is automatically subtracted when we consider the connected matrix element, and therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} q^{(0)} \left(-\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z} \right)_{A_z=0} &= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{i\xi z P_z} \text{Tr} \gamma_z \langle P_z | \bar{\psi}(z) \psi(0) | P_z \rangle_C \\ &= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{i\xi z P_z} \text{Tr} \gamma_z \langle P_z | \bar{\psi}(0) \psi(-z) | P_z \rangle_C, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B6})$$

where we have used translation invariance to shift the operator in the negative z direction.

Changing variables from z to $-z$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} q^{(0)} \left(-\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z} \right)_{A_z=0} &= \int_{\infty}^{-\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{-i\xi z P_z} \text{Tr} \gamma_z \langle P_z | \bar{\psi}(0) \psi(z) | P_z \rangle_C \\ &= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{-i\xi z P_z} \text{Tr} \gamma_z \langle P_z | \bar{\psi}(0) \psi(z) | P_z \rangle_C, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B7})$$

where the second equality follows from swapping the limits of integration. Applying the trace trick to products of fermion fields again, we obtain

$$q^{(0)} \left(-\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z} \right)_{A_z=0} = - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{-i\xi z P_z} \langle P_z | \psi(z) \gamma_z \bar{\psi}(0) | P_z \rangle_C. \quad (\text{B8})$$

Comparing this result with Equations (B1) and (B2) we obtain

$$q^{(0)} \left(\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z} \right) = -\bar{q}^{(0)} \left(-\xi, \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{P_z}, \frac{M_N}{P_z} \right). \quad (\text{B9})$$

Although this result was derived in axial gauge, gauge invariance ensures the results hold without fixing a specific gauge.

-
- [1] R. Brock et al. (CTEQ), Rev. Mod. Phys. **67**, 157 (1995).
 - [2] G. F. Sterman, An Introduction to quantum field theory (Cambridge University Press, 1994).
 - [3] J. Collins, Foundations of perturbative QCD (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
 - [4] F. Arbabifar, A. N. Khorramian, and M. Soleymaninia, Phys.Rev. **D89**, 034006 (2014), 1311.1830.
 - [5] R. Ball, S. Forte, A. Guffanti, E. Nocera, G. Ridolfi, and J. Rojo (NNPDF Collaboration), Nucl.Phys. **B874**, 36 (2013), 1303.7236.
 - [6] P. Jimenez-Delgado, H. Avakian, and W. Melnitchouk (Jefferson Lab Angular Momentum (JAM) Collaboration), Phys.Lett. **B738**, 263 (2014), 1403.3355.
 - [7] S. Dulat, T.-J. Hou, J. Gao, M. Guzzi, J. Huston, P. Nadolsky, J. Pumplin, C. Schmidt, D. Stump, and C. P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 033006 (2016), 1506.07443.
 - [8] T.-J. Hou et al. (2016), 1607.06066.
 - [9] W. Detmold, W. Melnitchouk, and A. W. Thomas, Eur.Phys.J.direct **C3**, 1 (2001), hep-lat/0108002.
 - [10] W. Detmold, W. Melnitchouk, and A. W. Thomas, Mod.Phys.Lett. **A18**, 2681 (2003), hep-lat/0310003.
 - [11] X. Ji, Phys.Rev.Lett. **110**, 262002 (2013), 1305.1539.
 - [12] X. Ji, Sci.China Phys.Mech.Astron. **57**, 1407 (2014), 1404.6680.
 - [13] H.-W. Lin, J.-W. Chen, S. D. Cohen, and X. Ji, Phys.Rev. **D91**, 054510 (2015), 1402.1462.
 - [14] L. Gamberg, Z.-B. Kang, I. Vitev, and H. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B743**, 112 (2015), 1412.3401.
 - [15] X. Ji and J.-H. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 034006 (2015), 1505.07699.
 - [16] C. Alexandrou, K. Cichy, V. Drach, E. Garcia-Ramos, K. Hadjiyiannakou, K. Jansen, F. Steffens, and C. Wiese, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 014502 (2015), 1504.07455.
 - [17] J.-W. Chen, S. D. Cohen, X. Ji, H.-W. Lin, and J.-H. Zhang, Nucl. Phys. **B911**, 246 (2016), 1603.06664.
 - [18] Y.-Q. Ma and J.-W. Qiu (2014), 1404.6860.
 - [19] G. S. Bali, B. Lang, B. U. Musch, and A. Schfer, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 094515 (2016), 1602.05525.
 - [20] R. Narayanan and H. Neuberger, JHEP **0603**, 064 (2006), hep-th/0601210.
 - [21] M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, JHEP **1102**, 051 (2011), 1101.0963.
 - [22] M. Lüscher, JHEP **1304**, 123 (2013), 1302.5246.
 - [23] H. Makino and H. Suzuki, PTEP **2014**, 063B02 (2014), 1403.4772.
 - [24] K. Hieda and H. Suzuki (2016), 1606.04193.
 - [25] J.-W. Chen, X. Ji, and J.-H. Zhang (2016), 1609.08102.
 - [26] T. Ishikawa, Y.-Q. Ma, J.-W. Qiu, and S. Yoshida (2016), 1609.02018.
 - [27] X. Xiong, X. Ji, J.-H. Zhang, and Y. Zhao (2013), 1310.7471.
 - [28] S. Moch and J. Vermaseren, Nucl.Phys. **B573**, 853 (2000), hep-ph/9912355.
 - [29] J. A. M. Vermaseren and S. Moch, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **89**, 131 (2000), hep-ph/0004235.
 - [30] R. S. Thorne and W. K. Tung (2008), pp. 332–351, [,2(2008)], 0809.0714.
 - [31] F. Olness and I. Schienbein, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **191**, 44 (2009), 0812.3371.

- [32] T. Binoth et al. (SM and NLO Multileg Working Group) (2010), pp. 21–189, 1003.1241.
- [33] J. C. Collins and D. E. Soper, Nucl.Phys. **B194**, 445 (1982).
- [34] M. Lüscher, PoS **LATTICE2013**, 016 (2014), 1308.5598.
- [35] A. Ramos, PoS **LATTICE2014**, 017 (2015), 1506.00118.
- [36] C. Monahan and K. Orginos, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 074513 (2015), 1501.05348.
- [37] N. H. Christ, B. Hasslacher, and A. H. Mueller, Phys. Rev. **D6**, 3543 (1972).
- [38] O. Nachtmann, Nucl. Phys. **B63**, 237 (1973).
- [39] H. Georgi and H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. **D9**, 416 (1974).
- [40] F. M. Steffens, M. D. Brown, W. Melnitchouk, and S. Sanches, Phys. Rev. **C86**, 065208 (2012), 1210.4398.
- [41] H. Suzuki, PTEP **2013**, 083B03 (2013), 1304.0533.
- [42] M. Asakawa, T. Hatsuda, E. Itou, M. Kitazawa, and H. Suzuki (FlowQCD Collaboration), Phys.Rev. **D90**, 011501 (2014), 1312.7492.
- [43] V. N. Gribov and L. N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **15**, 675 (1972), [Yad. Fiz.15,1218(1972)].
- [44] Y. L. Dokshitzer, Sov. Phys. JETP **46**, 641 (1977), [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.73,1216(1977)].
- [45] G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. **B126**, 298 (1977).
- [46] E. Titchmarsh, The Theory of Functions (Oxford University Press, 1939).
- [47] A. e. Poularikas, The Transforms and Applications Handbook (CRC Press, 1996).